

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are currently pending. Claim 10 was previously canceled. Claims 11-20 were recently proposed but were not entered. To the extent necessary, Applicant hereby cancels claims 11-20.

In view of the Examiner's recognition of allowable subject matter in claim 4, Applicant has canceled claims 1-3 and 5-9 without prejudice to place the application in condition for issuance of a notice of allowance. As explained in the Amendment and Request for Reconsideration dated November 3, 2005, Applicant has amended claim 4 because Examiner recognized allowable subject matter in claim 4 if rewritten in independent form. Therefore, Applicant has amended claim 4 to be rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Applicant has also added new claims 21-24. Claims 21, 23, and 24 depend on claim 4 and claim 22 depends on claim 21, which depends on claim 4. The subject matter of the new and amended claims is supported by the specification and no new matter is added. New claims 21-24 should be considered allowable as they depend from an allowable claim. Accordingly, reconsideration and issuance of a notice of allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 and 5-7 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,954,238 to Nivet (hereinafter, "Nivet") in view of U.S.

Serial No. 10/608,735

Amdt. dated January 6, 2006

Reply to Advisory Action of November 22, 2005

Patent No. 3,054,585 to Roberts et al. (hereinafter, "Roberts et al.") for the reasons set forth in the final Office Action mailed on October 17, 2005. The Examiner has also rejected claim 8 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Nivet in view of Roberts et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,496,094 to May III (hereinafter, "May III") for the reasons set forth in the final Office Action. Finally, the Examiner has rejected claim 9 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Nivet in view of Roberts et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 3,848,839 to Tillman (hereinafter, "Tillman") for the reasons set forth in the final Office Action. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the reasons set forth in prior responses. However, for efficiency and without prejudice, Applicant has canceled claims 1-3 and 5-9. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's recognition of allowable subject matter in claim 4.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the patent application and the claims, as amended, are in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant would appreciate the courtesy of a telephone call should the Examiner have any questions or comments with respect to this Amendment and Request for Consideration or the claim language for purposes of efficiently resolving same.

Serial No. 10/608,735

Amdt. dated January 6, 2006

Reply to Advisory Action of November 22, 2005

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 03-2026 for any fees associated with this Amendment and Request for Consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

By:  _____

Christine W. Trebilcock

PTO Registration No. 41,373

Alicia M. Passerin

PTO Registration No. 54,363

Cohen & Grigsby, P.C.

11 Stanwix Street, 15th Floor

Pittsburgh, PA 15222

(412) 297-4900

Agents for Applicant

1031324_1.DOC